

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/701,939	11/04/2003	Guohua Chen	ARC 3307 US R1	5013
7:	590 11/16/2006		EXAM	INER
EDGAR R. CATAXINOS			KENNEDY, SHARON E	
TraskBritt, PC				
P. O. Box 2550			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Salt Lake City, UT 84110			1615	

DATE MAILED: 11/16/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Antique Occurrence	10/701,939	CHEN ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Sharon E. Kennedy	1615				
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING ID. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION (136(a)). In no event, however, may a reply be studied and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS frow the course the application to become ABANDON	DN. timely filed m the mailing date of this communication. NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
	is action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	<u>-</u>					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-113</u> is/are pending in the application.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) Claim(s) is/are rejected.						
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-113</u> are subject to restriction and/o	or election requirement.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct						
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached Office	ce Action or form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea 	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applica ority documents have been recei au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ved in this National Stage				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis Attachment(s) 1) \[\sum \text{Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)} \]	4) 🔲 Interview Summa	nry (PTO-413)				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	aconcrippioacion				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- Claims 1-71, 80-105, drawn to an injectable depot formulation, classified in class 424, subclass 426.
- II. Claims 72-78, 106-112, drawn to a method of using the injectable depot formulation, classified in class 424, subclass 426.
- III. Claims 79 and 113, drawn to a kit containing an injectable depot formulation, classified in class 424, subclass 426.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product. See MPEP § 806.05(h). In the instant case the product as claimed can be used as a surgically implantable depot.

Inventions I and III are related as mutually exclusive species in an intermediate-final product relationship. Distinctness is proven for claims in this relationship if the intermediate product is useful to make other than the final product, and the species are patentably distinct (MPEP § 806.05(j)). In the instant case, the intermediate product is deemed to be useful as two separate applications of a drug depot, for example, the product does not have to be mixed, the agent could be applied locally and the polymer

applied in the technique known as "paving" to form a barrier to the agent, and the inventions are deemed patentably distinct because there is nothing on this record to show them to be obvious variants.

Because these inventions are independent or distinct for the reasons given above and there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is not required because the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art due to their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Election

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species:

Species 1: Copolymer of lactic acid and glycolic acid as disclosed especially in applicant's published paragraph [0020];

Species 2: Copolymer of lactic acid and caprolactone-based polymer as disclosed especially in applicant's published paragraph [0026]; and

Species 3: Polymer of lactic acid as disclosed especially in applicant's published paragraph [0027].

The species are independent or distinct because: each are directed to different bioerodible polymers.

Art Unit: 1615

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which depend from or otherwise require all the limitations of an allowable generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species.

MPEP § 809.02(a).

A telephone call was made to Edgar Cataxinos on November 13, 2006 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To reserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not

distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the inventions or species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the inventions or species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C.103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sharon E. Kennedy whose telephone number is 571/272-4948. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Woodward, can be reached on 571/272-8373.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

Application/Control Number: 10/701,939

Art Unit: 1615

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sharon E. Kennedy
Sharon E. Kennedy
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1615

Page 6